Case: 4:22-cv-00609-NAB Doc. #: 1-1 Filed: 06/06/22 Page: 1 of 19 PageID #: 5

# **EXHIBIT A**



Search for Cases by: Select Search Method...

**Judicial Links** 

eFiling

Help

| Contact Us | Print

GrantedPublicAccess Logoff JTCHAR2015

2211-CC00360 - LUIS WEGER V CUSHMAN AND WAKEFIELD US ET CASE

Case Parties & Adwareys

Docket Entries

Charges, Judgments & Sentences

Service Information

Filings Due

Scheduled Hearings & Trials

Ascending

Civil Judgments

Garnishments/ Execution

Click here to eFile on Case

Click here to Respond to Selected Documents

Sort Date Entries: Descending **Display Options:** 

All Entries

Document ID - 22-SMCC-764; Served To - CUSHMAN AND WAKEFIELD U.S., INC.; Server - ST LOUIS COUNTY SHERIFF; Served Date - 06-MAY-22; Served Time - 09:00:00; Service Type - Sheriff Department; Reason Description - Served; Service Text - SERVED TO CUSHMAN AND WAKEFIELD US INC VIA LCW-D GARCIA, INTAKE SPECIALIST

Notice of Service

22-SMCC-764; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service.

Corporation Served

Document ID - 22-SMCC-765; Served To - MASTERCARD INTERNATIONAL INC; Server - ST LOUIS COUNTY SHERIFF; Served Date - 06-MAY-22; Served Time - 02:00:00; Service Type - Sheriff Department; Reason Description - Served; Service Text - SERVED TO MASTRCARD INTERNATIONAL INC C/O LCW, D GARCIA, INTAKE SPECIALIST

Notice of Service

22-SMCC-765; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service.

04/20/2022 Summons Issued-Circuit

Document ID: 22-SMCC-765, for MASTERCARD INTERNATIONAL INC. SUMMONS SAVED AND ATTACHED IN PDF FORM FOR ATTORNEY TO RETRIEVE FROM SECURE CASE.NET. EPH

Summons Issued-Circuit

Document ID: 22-SMCC-764, for CUSHMAN AND WAKEFIELD U.S., INC..

04/19/2022 Filing Info Sheet eFiling

Filed By: JEFFREY DAVID HACKNEY

Pet Filed in Circuit Ct

Petition for Damages.

Filed By: JEFFREY DAVID HACKNEY

On Behalf Of: LUIS WEGER

Judge Assigned

Case.net Version 5.14.51 Return to Top of Page Released 05/11/2022

Case: 4:22-cv-00609-NAB Doc. #: 1-1 Filed: 06/06/22 Page: 3 of 19 PageID #: 7



#### IN THE 11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, ST. CHARLES COUNTY, MISSOURI

Judge or Division:	Case Number: 2211-CC00360		
DEBORAH JEAN ALESSI			
Plaintiff/Petitioner:	Plaintiff's/Petitioner's Attorney/Address		
LUIS WEGER	JEFFREY DAVID HACKNEY		
	2 CITY PLACE		
	SUITE 200		
VS.	CREVE COEUR, MO 63141		
Defendant/Respondent:	Court Address:		
CUSHMAN AND WAKEFIELD U.S., INC.	300 N 2nd STREET		
Nature of Suit:	SAINT CHARLES, MO 63301		
CC Other Miscellaneous Actions		(Date File Stamp)	
Summons in Civil Case			

Nature of Suit:		SAINT CHARLES, IV	03301	
CC Other Miscellaneous A	actions			(Date File Stamp)
	Sui	mmons in Civil	Case	,,
The State of Missouri to	: CUSHMAN AND W	AKEFIELD U.S., INC.		
	Alias:			
120 S. CENTRAL AVE. CLAYTON, MO 63105				
COURT SEAL OF	copy of which is at plaintiff/petitioner a exclusive of the da	tached, and to serve at the above address by of service. If you fa	is court and to file your p a copy of your pleading o all within 30 days after re all to file your pleading, ju anded in the petition.	upon the attorney for eceiving this summons,
ST. CHARLES COUNTY	4/20/2	022	/S/ Cheryl (	Crowder
011 0111 111220 000111 1	Date	<del></del>	Clerk	
	Further Information:			
I certify that I have serve delivering a copy of the leaving a copy of the leaving a copy of the other: other:	d the above Summons by: ne summons and petition to summons and petition at the pration) delivering a copy of	(check one) the defendant/respond he dwelling house or usu, a perso of the summons and peti (name)	al place of abode of the defen at least 18 years of age reside	ding therein (title) (address)
Printed Nam	e of Sheriff or Server		Signature of She	eriff or Server
	Must be sworn before a no	otary public if not served I	•	
(Seal)		before me on		(date).
	wy commission expires.	Date	Nota	ry Public
Sheriff's Fees, if applicab	le			
Summons	\$			
Non Est	\$			
Sheriff's Deputy Salary				
Supplemental Surcharge	\$ 10.00			
Mileage	\$(_	miles @ \$	per mile)	
Total	\$			
A copy of the summons an see Supreme Court Rule 5		on <b>each</b> defendant/respo	ondent. For methods of service	e on all classes of suits,

Case: 4:22-cv-00609-NAB Doc. #: 1-1 Filed: 06/06/22 Page: 4 of 19 PageID #: 8



#### IN THE 11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, ST. CHARLES COUNTY, MISSOURI

			7
Judge or Division:		Case Number: 2211-CC00360	
DEBORAH JEAN ALESSI			
Plaintiff/Petitioner:		Plaintiff's/Petitioner's Attorney/Address	
LUIS WEGER		JEFFREY DAVID HACKNEY	
		2 CITY PLACE	
		SUITE 200	
	VS.	CREVE COEUR, MO 63141	
Defendant/Respondent:		Court Address:	
CUSHMAN AND WAKEFIELD U.S., INC.		300 N 2nd STREET	
Nature of Suit:		SAINT CHARLES, MO 63301	
CC Other Miscellaneous Actions			(Date File Star

CC Other Miscellaneous A	Actions			(Date File Stamp)
	Su	mmons in Civ	/il Case	
The State of Missouri to	: MASTERCARD INT	<b>ERNATIONAL INC</b>	·	
	Alias:			
R/A CT CORPORATION SYST 120 SOUTH CLAYTON AVE CLAYTON, MO 63105	EM			
COURT SEAL OF				r pleading to the petition, a
SOURT OF THE SOUR	plaintiff/petitioner exclusive of the da	at the above addre		g upon the attorney for receiving this summons, judgment by default may
ST. CHARLES COUNTY	4/20/2	022	/S/ Cher	yl Crowder
	Dat Further Information:	e	C	lerk
	_	neriff's or Server's		
			n 30 days after the date of issu	ıe.
	d the above Summons by			
	ne summons and petition t			for along the one of any traite
☐ leaving a copy of the	summons and petition at t	ne dwelling nouse or	usual place of abode of the def rson at least 18 years of age re	seiding therein
(for service on a corp	oration) delivering a copy	of the summons and p	petition to:	osiding therein.
		(name)		(title).
☐ other:				·
Served at				(address)
			n (c	
	(County/On	ly of Ot. Louis), Mo, o	(0	().
Printed Nam	e of Sheriff or Server	<del></del>	Signature of S	Sheriff or Server
	Must be sworn before a n	otary public if not serve	ed by an authorized officer:	
				(date).
(Seal)	M			
	My commission expires:	Date	N	otary Public
Sheriff's Fees, if applicab	ماد			,
Summons	\$			
Non Est	\$			
Sheriff's Deputy Salary				
Supplemental Surcharge	\$ <u>10.00</u>			
Mileage	\$(_	miles @ \$	per mile)	
Total	\$			
A copy of the summons an see Supreme Court Rule 5		on <b>each</b> defendant/re	espondent. For methods of serv	vice on all classes of suits,



Supplemental Surcharge

see Supreme Court Rule 54.

Mileage

10.00

### Filed: 06/06/22 Page: 5 of 19 PageID #: 9

### IN THE 11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, ST. CHARLES COUNTY, MISSOURI

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Judge or Division:	Case Number: 2211-CC00360	
DEBORAH JEAN ALESSI		
Plaintiff/Petitioner:	Plaintiff's/Petitioner's Attorney/Address	
LUIS WEGER	JEFFREY DAVID HACKNEY	5/11
	2 CITY PLACE	700
	SUITE 200	
	CREVE COEUR, MO 63141	
Defendant/Respondent:	Court Address:	
CUSHMAN AND WAKEFIELD U.S., INC.	300 N 2nd STREET	
Nature of Suit:	SAINT CHARLES, MO 63301	
CC Other Miscellaneous Actions		(Date File Stamp)
Su	ummons in Civil Case	

	7	2	
- (	)	<b>N</b> 2	

The State of Missouri to	: MASTERCARD INTERNATIONAL INC	
R/A CT CORPORATION SYSTE 120 SOUTH CLAYTON AVE CLAYTON, MO 63105	Alias:	
COURT SEAL OF	copy of which is attached, and to serve plaintiff/petitioner at the above address	his court and to file your pleading to the petition, a e a copy of your pleading upon the attorney for s all within 30 days after receiving this summons, fail to file your pleading, judgment by default may anded in the petition.
ST. CHARLES COUNTY	4/20/2022	/S/ Cheryl Crowder
	Date Further Information:	Clerk
certify that I have served delivering a copy of the leaving a copy of the service on a corpo other:  Served at  Printed Name	, a perso ration) delivering a copy of the summons and pet	dent.  ual place of abode of the defendant/respondent with on at least 18 years of age residing therein.  ition to:  INTAKE SPECIALIST  (title)  (address)  (time).
• •	My commission expires:	Notoni Bublio
Sheriff's Fees, if applicable	The state of the s	Notary Public
Summons	• •	
Non Est	\$	
Sheriff's Deputy Salary		

A copy of the summons and petition must be served on each defendant/respondent. For methods of service on all classes of suits,

miles @ \$.\_\_\_\_ per mile)

Case: 4/22-cv-00609-NAB	Doc. #: 1-1	Filed: 06/06/22	Page: 6 of 19 PageID #: 10
-------------------------	-------------	-----------------	----------------------------



## IN THE 11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, ST. CHARLES COUNTY, MISSOURI

with the second		
Judge or Division: DEBORAH JEAN ALESSI	Case Number: 2211-CC00360	J 7
Plaintiff/Petitioner: LUIS WEGER vs.	Plaintiff's/Petitioner's Attorney/Address JEFFREY DAVID HACKNEY 2 CITY PLACE SUITE 200 CREVE COEUR, MO 63141	5.20
Defendant/Respondent: CUSHMAN AND WAKEFIELD U.S., INC.	Court Address: 300 N 2nd STREET SAINT CHARLES, MO 63301	
Nature of Suit: CC Other Miscellaneous Actions		(Date File Stamp)

**Summons in Civil Case** 

The State of Missouri to:	CUSHMAN AND WAREFIELD U.S., INC	·
400 C CENTRAL AVE	Alias: 20 0 10 - 0	
120 S. CENTRAL AVE. CLAYTON, MO 63105	Alias: 30 CTCOR	and the second s
COURT SEAL OF	You are summoned to appear before	this court and to file your pleading to the petition, a
	plaintiff/patitioner at the above address	
ST. CHARLES COUNTY	4/20/2022	/S/ Cheryl Crowder
31. CHARLES COOK!	Date	Clerk
	Further Information:	
	Sheriff's or Server's	Return 23
Note to serving officer:	Summons should be returned to the court within	30 days after the date of issue
I certify that I have served	the above Summons by: (check one)	
والملاقة والمستوان	aummone and notition to the defendant/respon	ndent.
leaving a copy of the s	ummons and petition at the dwelling house or u	sual place of abode of the defendatives police it with
(for service on a corpo	ration) delivering a copy of the summons and p  CW - D. GARCIA (name)	(une).
other:		<u> </u>
		(address)
Served atCT CC	ORPORATION	- MIV C AIT
in St. Lou	<b>s County</b> (County/City of St. Louis), MO, or	MAY 0 20 (data) at Q AM (time).
	2	
<u> </u>	Tana Naxa.	dat
Printed Name	e of Sheriff or Server	Signature of Sheriff or Server
7 ////03 / 13///	Must be sworn before a notary public if not serve	ed by an authorized officer:
(O I)	Subscribed and sworn to before me on	
(Seal)	My commission expires:	
	Date	Notary Public
Sheriff's Fees, if applicab	اما	
Summons	\$	
Non Est	\$	
Sheriff's Deputy Salary	<b>▼</b>	
Supplemental Surcharge	\$ 10.00	
Mileage	\$( miles @ \$	per mile)
Total	\$	
A copy of the summore on	d netition must be served on each defendant/re	espondent. For methods of service on all classes of suits,
see Supreme Court Rule 5	A	
see Supreme Court Rule o		

22-5mcc-4008



## IN THE 11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, ST. CHARLES COUNTY, MISSOURI

Case Number: 2211-CC00360	J
Plaintiff's/Petitioner's Attorney/Address JEFFREY DAVID HACKNEY 2 CITY PLACE SUITE 200 CREVE COEUR, MO 63141	5.20
Court Address: 300 N 2nd STREET SAINT CHARLES, MO 63301	
0,4111 013 11225, 113 0000	(Date File Stamp)
	Plaintiff's/Petitioner's Attorney/Address JEFFREY DAVID HACKNEY 2 CITY PLACE SUITE 200 CREVE COEUR, MO 63141 Court Address:

SB	
5.20	

**Summons in Civil Case** 

he State of Missouri to:	CUSHMAN AND WAKEFIELD U.S., INC.	,				
	Alias:					
20 S. CENTRAL AVE. LAYTON, MO 63105	Alias: 30 CTCOR					
COURT SEAL OF	You are summoned to appear before th	is court and to file your pleading to the petition, a				
COURT OF	copy of which is attached, and to serve	a copy of your pleading upon the attorney for all within 30 days after receiving this summons,				
	plaintim/petitioner at the above address	ail to file your pleading, judgment by default may				
	be taken against you for the relief dema	anded in the petition.				
ST. CHARLES COUNTY	4/20/2022	/S/ Cheryl Crowder				
31. OFFICEEO GOOTT	Date	Clerk				
	Further Information:					
	Sheriff's or Server's R	eturn 60 days after the date of issue(25)				
Note to serving officer: S	ummons should be returned to the court within 3	30 days after the date of issue.				
I certify that I have served	the above Summons by: (check one)					
delivering a copy of the	summons and petition to the defendant/respond	ent.				
☐ leaving a copy of the su	immons and petition at the dwelling house or usi	ual place of abode of the defendant/respondent with on at least 18 years of age residing therein.				
M (for consider on a corner	ation) delivering a copy of the summons and pet	ition tourtake SPECIALIST TO				
(IOI service on a corpor	LCW - D. GARCIA (name)	(title).				
other:		<u> </u>				
		Direct F				
Served atCT CORPORATION (address)						
in St. Louis County (County/City of St. Louis), MO, on MAY 0 20 (Cap at a C AM (time).						
- A	20	112				
- 1 Hz	ing / bon =	and the same of th				
	of Sheriff or Server	Signature of Sheriff or Server				
	Must be sworn before a notary public if not served	by an authorized officer:				
	Subscribed and sworn to before me on					
(Seal)						
, ,	My commission expires:	Notary Public				
	Date	Notary 1 dono				
Sheriff's Fees, if applicable	•					
Summons	\$					
Non Est	\$					
Sheriff's Deputy Salary	e 10.00					
Supplemental Surcharge	\$10.00 \$(miles @ \$	per mile)				
Mileage	5(IIIIes @ 4	_ <del>                                     </del>				
Total	b	pondent. For methods of service on all classes of suits.				
A copy of the summons and	i petition must de served on <b>each</b> defendantifes I	pondent. For methods of service on all classes of suits,				
see Supreme Court Rule 54	·					

Case: 4:22-cv-00609-NAA Doc. #: 11 Filed: 06/06/22 Page: 8 of 19 PageID #: 12

### IN THE 11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, ST. CHARLES COUNTY, MISSOURI

			$C_{\alpha}$
Judge or Division:		Case Number: 2211-CC00360	
DEBORAH JEAN ALESSI			
Plaintiff/Petitioner:		Plaintiff's/Petitioner's Attorney/Address	/~
LUIS WEGER		JEFFREY DAVID HACKNEY	5/1
		2 CITY PLACE	
		SUITE 200	
	VS.	CREVE COEUR, MO 63141	
Defendant/Respondent:		Court Address:	
CUSHMAN AND WAKEFIELD U.S., INC.		300 N 2nd STREET	
Nature of Suit:		SAINT CHARLES, MO 63301	
CC Other Miscellaneous Actions			(Date File Stamp)

	Alono .	(Date File Stamp)			
Summons in Civil Case					
The State of Missouri to:	MASTERCARD INTERNATIONAL INC	7900			
R/A CT CORPORATION SYSTE 120 SOUTH CLAYTON AVE CLAYTON, MO 63105	Alias:				
COURT SEAL OF	You are summoned to appear before this court and to file your pcopy of which is attached, and to serve a copy of your pleading plaintiff/petitioner at the above address all within 30 days after rexclusive of the day of service. If you fail to file your pleading, jube taken against you for the relief demanded in the petition.	upon the attorney for receiving this summons.			
ST. CHARLES COUNTY		Crowder			
	Date Cler	rk			
	Further Information:				
	Sheriff's or Server's Return				
Note to serving officer: S	Summons should be returned to the court within 30 days after the date of issue.				
I certify that I have served	the above Summons by: (check one)				
delivering a copy of the	summons and petition to the defendant/respondent.	~			
☐ leaving a copy of the su	ummons and petition at the dwelling house or usual place of abode of the defer	ndant/respondent with			
,	a person at least 19 years of ago regi	dina therein.			
	etign) delivering a copy of the summons and petition to:				
	OVV - D. GARCÍA (name) INTAKE SPECIAL	title).			
other:		<u> တိုင</u> ် <b>င်္သ</b> ္ခဲ့ခဲ့			
2		Cat the same			
	CT CORPORATION MAY - 6 2022	(address)			
in et Louis	County (County/City of St. Louis), MO, on(dat	te) at(time).			
	71				
1/	Han Whom	, <del>,</del>			
Printed Name	of Sheriff or Server Signature of She	wiff or Server			
		SALI OI SEIVEI			
	Must be sworn before a notary public if not served by an authorized officer:				
(Seal)	Subscribed and sworn to before me on	(date).			
	My commission expires:				
'		ary Public			
Sheriff's Fees, if applicable		ny r done			
Summons	<b>\$</b>				
Non Est	¢				
Sheriff's Deputy Salary	<b>\$</b>				
Supplemental Surcharge	\$ 10.00				
Mileage	\$( miles @ \$ per mile)				
Total	Φ ( miles @ \$ per mile)				
see Supreme Court Rule 54.	petition must be served on each defendant/respondent. For methods of service	e on all classes of suits, \ \ \			
see Supreme Court Rule 34.	lab(M	N			

Case: 4:22-cv-00609-NAB Doc. #: 1-1 Filed: 06/06/22 Page: 9 of 29219110 C 00360

#### IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF ST. CHARLES COUNTY, MISSOURI

LUIS WEGER,	
Plaintiff )	Cause No.:
v. )	) ) Division:
CUSHMAN & WAKEFIELD	Bivision.
U.S., Inc.	
And	
MASTERCARD	
INTERNATIONAL, Inc.	
)	)
Defendants.	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
Serve Agents for both	
Defendants at:	
CT Corporation System	
120 S. Central Ave.	
Clayton, MO 63105	<b>)</b>

#### **PETITION FOR DAMAGES**

COMES NOW, Plaintiff Luis Weger ("Plaintiff" or "Captain Weger"), by and through undersigned counsel, and for his Petition for Damages, states as follows:

#### **PARTIES AND VENUE**

- 1. Plaintiff is citizen residing in St. Charles County in the State of Missouri.
- 2. Defendant Cushman and Wakefield U.S., Inc. ("Cushman") is a foreign corporation duly organized and existing by virtue of law, conducting operations in St. Charles County, Missouri.
- 3. Defendant Mastercard International ("Mastercard") is a foreign corporation duly organized and existing by virtue of law, with operations in St. Charles County.
- 4. Both Cushman and Mastercard (collectively, "Defendants") are engaged in interstate commerce.

Case: 4:22-cv-00609-NAB Doc. #: 1-1 Filed: 06/06/22 Page: 10 of 19 PageID #: 14

5. Conduct alleged in this Petition to have violated federal and Missouri law took place in St. Charles County, where Plaintiff was employed by Defendants, and thus venue in the Circuit Court of St. Charles County is proper, pursuant to § 508.010.4 MO Rev. Stat. and other relevant venue provisions.

6. Plaintiff at all times relevant hereto was a member of the United States Army Reserves and is protected from discrimination pursuant to the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act, 38 U.S.C. § 4301 *et seq* as amended (henceforth "USERRA").

7. USERRA provides that a person who belongs to a uniformed service shall not be denied "retention in employment ... or any benefit of employment by an employer on the basis of that membership." 38 U.S.C. § 4311(a).

- 8. During all relevant times herein, Defendants were operating under and subject to the provisions of USERRA and the relationship of employer and employee existed at all times between Defendants and Plaintiff.
  - 9. Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable in this case.

#### FACTS COMMON TO ALL COUNTS

#### **Defendants jointly employed Plaintiff**

- 10. Plaintiff began working for Cushman on March 30, 2020, as a Procurement Manager assigned to the Mastercard account.
  - 11. Mastercard was, at all relevant times, a client of Cushman's.
- 12. Formally, Plaintiff was an employee of Cushman, but Mastercard—along with Cushman—also exercised control over his essential terms and conditions of employment as a joint employer, including but not limited to hiring, firing, discipline, supervision and direction, as further elaborated upon herein.

Case: 4:22-cv-00609-NAB Doc. #: 1-1 Filed: 06/06/22 Page: 11 of 19 PageID #: 15

13. As joint employers, both defendants are subject to the obligations and liabilities imposed by employment statutes and regulations.

- 14. Cushman and Mastercard had highly interrelated operations & shared control over management and labor relations, as evidenced in part by the fact that after beginning work, Plaintiff was ordered by Cushman to report to Mastercard on a daily basis, despite Cushman being his nominal employer.
- 15. Cushman and Mastercard had highly interrelated operations & shared control over management, as evidenced in part by agreements between Mastercard & Cushman providing for shared responsibility with regard to employee management and control.
- 16. Cushman and Mastercard had highly interrelated operations & shared control over management and labor relations, as evidenced in part by Mastercard setting work rules, standards, and locations; providing Plaintiff with Mastercard equipment including a laptop, badge and peripherals; and establishing expectations and deadlines for deliverables.
- 17. Cushman employees would receive direction directly from Mastercard leadership, many times with minimal intervention by Cushman on-site management.
- 18. Upon information and belief, Mastercard and Cushman were financially integrated; for example, both companies would benefit from cost-cutting measures with regard to overhead.
- 19. During the term of his employment, Plaintiff brought up joint-employment concerns to Paula Mangorelli during a dinner with the Mastercard Account leadership team; he expressed to her concerns that Mastercard and Cushman were joint employers because of how much involvement Mastercard had in the day-to-day operations.
- 20. In a properly managed account, Mastercard would communicate to their Cushman counterparts who would then inform the team on the priorities or initiatives requested.

Case: 4:22-cv-00609-NAB Doc. #: 1-1 Filed: 06/06/22 Page: 12 of 19 PageID #: 16

21. However, Plaintiff noted that the Mastercard leadership would instruct Cushman members

on what to do, where to sit, and numerous times instructed how to alter documentation to fit

Mastercard's preferences.

22. Plaintiff was treated like a Mastercard employee, given Mastercard badges, had Mastercard

computers and desks, and had his efforts monitored like a Mastercard employee.

Plaintiff was an excellent employee

23. During his entire tenure, Plaintiff never had a negative review or performance issue, nor

was there any communication from Mastercard or Cushman indicating that his performance was

unsatisfactory or in question.

24. To the contrary, Plaintiff contributed considerably in positive ways which can be

objectively measured, such as significant cost savings to Mastercard, being critical in providing

COVID-19 mitigation supplies to key locations thus enabling the reopening of Mastercard offices

around the globe, and having received a strong year-end performance review.

25. Plaintiff continued to perform despite having to contend with Mastercard's sudden

demands regarding the sourcing and procurement through minority vendors within an extremely

short time frame during early 2021.

Plaintiff made protected complaints about Defendants' deceptive, irresponsible, and

discriminatory business practices

26. Such draconian demands also implicated potential ethical issues regarding deceptive

contracting methodologies, which Plaintiff raised to both Mastercard and Cushman executive

leadership, making Plaintiff a whistleblower with respect to the Missouri Whistleblower Protection

Act, MO Rev. Stat. § 285.575.

4

Case: 4:22-cv-00609-NAB Doc. #: 1-1 Filed: 06/06/22 Page: 13 of 19 PageID #: 17

27. The pressures regarding procurement were likely to result in the selection of unqualified or non-competitively bid providers.

- 28. Plaintiff raised concerns of policy/ethical violations to both Mastercard and Cushman leadership reflecting his high regard for ethical adherence.
- 29. With regard to sourcing minority vendors, there were various minority and disadvantaged businesses already available and involved, but Mastercard specifically wanted Black-owned businesses on an aggressive timeline.
- 30. It became very obvious that Mastercard did not intend to award to anyone other than Blackowned businesses, thus leading to reverse discrimination, fraud upon bidders who were not given a fair chance, and failure to honor shareholder obligations with respect to running the business in the most profitable way possible.
- 31. When Plaintiff brought this up to Cushman Procurement leadership, Plaintiff was told to be very careful about the language that Plaintiff was using with respect to privileging Black-owned vendors.
- 32. Plaintiff did not have an issue with adding Black-owned companies, only with very rushed unfair competition that was not in the best interests of the shareholders and would likely lead to awarding contracts to unqualified and/or overpriced bidders, while causing other established and reputable venders to lose time and resources in a futile effort.
- 33. On a call with both Cushman and Mastercard account leadership, Plaintiff expressed his concern that they were pushing ethical boundaries by inviting non-Black-owned businesses to compete while knowing that Mastercard intended to select Black-owned businesses.
- 34. Mike Case, the Mastercard Account Executive, told Plaintiff that he "didn't care about (Plaintiff's) principles and that (Plaintiff) needed to *learn to play in the gray*."

Case: 4:22-cv-00609-NAB Doc. #: 1-1 Filed: 06/06/22 Page: 14 of 19 PageID #: 18

35. Plaintiff told his leadership that STL is a "small big town" and that he was not going to ruin his reputation that he had built up based on fairness and ethical adherence.

- 36. In an attempt to satisfy both ethical standards and Mastercard's initiative to support the black-owned community, Plaintiff recommended the use of direct-negotiations, instead of fraudulent bid processes, and other alternative approaches which were rejected.
- 37. While underqualified and/or overpriced vendors received contracts, other disadvantaged groups were harmed, such as female-owned and minority businesses.

#### Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff due to his military service

- 38. Plaintiff is a Commissioned Officer with a security clearance and was serving as a Company Commander and Master Suicide Intervention Trainer in the Army Reserves and, intermittently, he would be called away for military service commensurate with his obligations as an Officer, Commander and Trainer.
- 39. Congress has stated its clear public policy of encouraging service in the uniformed services by enacting and expanding USERRA (38 U.S.C. § 4301 et seq as amended).
  - 40. Under 38 U.S.C. § 4301(a), Congress expressly states that the purposes of USERRA are:
    - a. "to encourage noncareer service in the uniformed services by eliminating or minimizing the disadvantages to civilian careers and employment which can result from such service (38 U.S.C. § 4301(a)(1));
    - b. to minimize the disruption to the lives of persons performing service in the uniformed services as well as to their employers, their fellow employees, and their communities, by providing for the prompt reemployment of such persons upon their completion of such service (38 U.S.C. § 4301(a)(2)); and

Case: 4:22-cv-00609-NAB Doc. #: 1-1 Filed: 06/06/22 Page: 15 of 19 PageID #: 19

- c. to prohibit discrimination against persons because of their service in the uniformed services (38 U.S.C. § 4301(a)(3))."
- 41. To the extent possible, Plaintiff continued to work as time permitted in order to complete his civilian tasks and minimize disruption while away on military duty and always managed a smooth transition.
- 42. There was never any undue disruption in service and attention provided to the customers while Plaintiff fulfilled his legally protected obligations.
- 43. Plaintiff provided advanced notice of all upcoming periods of military service whenever possible, including sharing his calendar with supervisors and peers.
- 44. Plaintiff was also extremely diligent about communicating with both Cushman and Mastercard regarding his obligations, including providing a letter from his Brigade Commander dated June 8, 2021.
- 45. It was only three business days after Plaintiff completed 10 days of military duty (July 11 21) in July and just two weeks before his Annual Training obligation in August that Plaintiff was illegally discharged by Defendants, on July 26, 2021.
- 46. No substantive or performance-related reason whatsoever was given for Plaintiff's termination.
- 47. Plaintiff was only informed that Mastercard requested his removal and that Mastercard "didn't need to provide a reason" for his dismissal.
- 48. Cushman cannot knowingly comply with the discriminatory request of a client without themselves discriminating.

Case: 4:22-cv-00609-NAB Doc. #: 1-1 Filed: 06/06/22 Page: 16 of 19 PageID #: 20

49. Other, similarly situated employees who were removed from a project were given more favorable treatment than Plaintiff, who was given virtually no time and no assistance to find an alternative assignment.

50. Plaintiff could have easily been re-assigned to another client by Cushman but it was clear Cushman had no interest in doing so.

51. Finally, the Master Service Agreement in effect between Mastercard and Cushman explicitly provides that Mastercard cannot remove Cushman employees from a project absent "good cause" and further provides 60 days to Cushman to provide a replacement in such an instance; these provisions were not complied with.

- 52. The financial damages to Plaintiff are severe.
- 53. Plaintiff's career is now damaged in a significant way, his military command time was compromised, and he has yet to secure comparable employment.
- 54. Plaintiff has incurred, and will continue to incur, attorney's fees and costs and other damages as a result of the illegal actions of Defendants.

#### **COUNT I**

# VIOLATIONS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES EMPLOYMENT AND REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS ACT 38 U.S.C. § 4323

#### (Against Both Defendants)

- 55. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.
- 56. Plaintiff's protected status was a motivating factor in Defendants' termination of Plaintiff's employment.
- 57. Defendants' termination of Plaintiff's employment constituted a violation of the USERRA.

Case: 4:22-cv-00609-NAB Doc. #: 1-1 Filed: 06/06/22 Page: 17 of 19 PageID #: 21

- 58. As a proximate result of Defendants' acts, Plaintiff has in the past and will in the future suffer loss of wages and benefits, loss of earning capacity, and loss of other emoluments of employment.
- 59. Defendants' actions were intentional and done with reckless disregard for Plaintiff's rights and for causing harm to Plaintiff. Such conduct should not be tolerated by this society.
- 60. Defendants' discrimination against Plaintiff due to Plaintiff's uniformed services status is part of a pattern and practice of such discrimination.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the following relief:

- 61. That the Court declare Defendants' conduct complained of herein to be in violation of Plaintiff's rights as secured by USERRA.
- 62. That the Court grant Plaintiff specific equitable relief including, but not limited to: (1) reinstatement into his position, including seniority, upgrading and other benefits, and further including equitable relief to offset the damage to Plaintiff's reputation; (2) injunctive relief prohibiting the Defendants, their owners, stockholders, officers, management personnel, employees, agents, successors and assigns and those acting in concert therewith from any conduct violating Plaintiff's rights or those of others similarly situated as secured by USERRA; and (3) a mandatory injunction requiring the Defendants to engage in company-wide training and a plan to force the Defendants to review and revise their employment practices, in particular their views on the uniformed service status and military obligations of their workforce.
- 63. That the Court award Plaintiff economic damages, appropriate past and future lost

Case: 4:22-cv-00609-NAB Doc. #: 1-1 Filed: 06/06/22 Page: 18 of 19 PageID #: 22

earnings and benefits with pre-judgment interest, and other affirmative relief;

- 64. That the Court award Plaintiff liquidated damages.
- 65. That the Court award Plaintiff attorney fees, court costs, litigation expenses, and other costs incurred in prosecuting this action.
- 66. That the Court award Plaintiff expert witness fees.
- 67. That the Court award Plaintiff such additional and further relief as it deems just and proper.

#### **COUNT II**

# RETALIATION/ILLEGAL DISCHARGE IN VIOLATION OF THE MISSOURI WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT, MO. REV. STAT. 285.575

#### (Against Both Defendants)

- 68. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference all preceding Paragraphs.
- 69. MO Rev. Stat. § 285.575 (the "Act") provides that "it shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to discharge an individual defined as a protected person in this section because of that person's status as a protected person."
- 70. Plaintiff reported serious misconduct to his employer which was in violation of clear mandates of public policy, as articulated by statutes and regulations cited herein, and refused to carry out directions to violate said policy, making him a "protected person" under the Act.
- 71. Said policy, for the prevention of fraud and dishonest business practices, is articulated in Missouri statutes, including but not limited to Mo Rev. Stat. § 288.395, § 516.120, and § 407.010 *et. seq.*

Case: 4:22-cv-00609-NAB Doc. #: 1-1 Filed: 06/06/22 Page: 19 of 19 PageID #: 23

72. Defendant stepped out of the scope of his defined responsibilities and routine job

duties in his complaints.

73. Plaintiff was illegally discharged and retaliated against by Defendant due to his

complaints about specific fraud and dishonest business practices being perpetrated by Defendant.

Plaintiff's protected activity played a role in the termination and had a

determinative influence.

74.

76.

75. Plaintiff's termination was clearly pretextual and illegal.

To the extent the Court deems necessary, this Count may be read as in the

alternative to Count I.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests judgment, pursuant to verdict by jury, in his

favor in an amount that is fair and reasonable for actual damages, back pay, front pay, liquidated

damages, interest on damages, for her attorney's costs and fees, and for such other and further

relief to which the Court deems just and proper, in an amount to be determined but in excess of

\$25,000.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Jeffrey D. Hackney

Jeffrey D. Hackney Missouri Bar No. 53158

HKM Employment Attorneys, LLC

7382 Pershing Ave., Suite 1W

St. Louis, Missouri 63130

Telephone: 314-207-3517

E-Mail: jhackney@hkm.com

Attorney for Plaintiff

11